

Congressional Investigation of Political Assassinations in the United States; The Two Approaches: From the Bottom Up vs. From the Top Down

Richard E. Sprague
Hartsdale, NY 10530

"When an adversary attacks with his weapons disguised as good works, to choose innocence is to choose defeat." — Tom Braden, "Saturday Evening Post", 1967

"Anticipating the wrong danger can divert attention from the real one that lies ahead, and may result in costly tactical errors." — "The Nation", 1968

"Beware that you do not lose the substance by grasping at the shadow."

— Aesop, c. 570 B.C.

The Two Approaches: Bottom Up and Top Down

For more than three years, two very different views have been held by both assassination researchers and Members of Congress, about the best strategy to arrive at the truth about political assassinations in the United States.

The more conservative view has been to build an investigative base from the ground upward. First the investigation would prove conspiracies in each of the individual cases beginning with the John F. Kennedy assassination, using "hard" or "slight" evidence. This view assumes that cover-up conspiracies and other murders that may have been committed as part of the cover-ups, would be investigated second. Any grand scale overall conspiracy to cover-up the cover-ups would eventually be investigated and detected and made public following exposure of the first layer of cover-ups.

The less conservative view has been that the political processes lying behind (1) the original assassination crimes, and (2) the massive cover-up structure overlaying all of the assassinations and murders related to them, should be investigated and exposed at the same time as the individual conspiracies.

The Two Original Resolutions of Downing and Gonzalez

The original resolutions for establishing a Select Committee in the House of Representatives to investigate assassinations, introduced by Rep. Thomas Downing and Rep. Henry Gonzalez in the House of Representatives in 1975, were somewhat related to these two views. The more conservative Downing resolution called for an investigation of only the JFK case. Downing's approach was the bottom up one, starting with the "hard" evidence of conspiracy in that case.

The less conservative resolution of Congressman Gonzalez called for reopening all four major cases, JFK, Robert F. Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and Gov. George Wallace, and more importantly, investigating the possible links among all four. Mr. Gonzalez stated that he believed that what the country might be experiencing was the control of the election process through assassinations. Thus his approach was more closely allied with the less conservative view.

Research groups, represented primarily by Mark Lane's Citizen's Commission of Inquiry (CCI), Bud

Fensterwald's Committee to Investigate Assassinations (CTIA), and Bob Katz' Assassination Information Bureau (AIB), were also divided in their views. CCI and CTIA took the bottom up approach and tended to support Downing. AIB took the overview political approach and tended to support Gonzalez. The Black Caucus, Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr., and others were primarily interested in a broad overview of the King assassination.

The coalition formed by Downing, Gonzalez, and Black Caucus supporters that finally brought about the creation of the Select Committee on Assassinations in the House, represents a mixture of these views and approaches.

Strategy for Investigation: Both

This article seeks to demonstrate that the work of the Select Committee will produce results provided that the Committee recognizes that the "bottom up" approach to investigating and exposing the truth cannot alone be used successfully, against the group of powerful individuals and their allies who currently control the environment in which all investigation attempts are being made.

This article seeks to demonstrate that the best way that the Select Committee, or any official body, can succeed against the power group, is to take advantage also of what will be labeled the "top down" approach to investigating, as a supplement to the "bottom up" approach.

The "Power Control Group"

A new study of the political assassinations in the U.S. ("The Taking of America 1-2-3")* describes a group of individuals in the United States and labels them "The Power Control Group," or PCG. A precise definition of the group is:

"The PCG is that group of individuals or organizations that knowingly participated in one or more of the assassination conspiracies or related murders or attempted murders, plus all the individuals who knowingly participated in or are still participating in the cover-ups of those conspiracies or murders."

The PCG therefore would include any people in the CIA, FBI, Justice Department, Secret Service, local

* "The Taking of America 1-2-3", Richard E. Sprague, self-published, Hartsdale, NY, 10530, 1976, 216 pp.

police departments or sheriffs' offices in Los Angeles, Memphis, Dallas, New Orleans, or Florida, judges, district attorneys, state attorneys general, other federal government agencies, the House, the Senate, the White House, the Congress, or the Department of Defense, plus any people in the media under the influence of any of the above, who participated in or who are participating in (1) the cover-ups or (2) the cover-ups of the cover-ups. There are clear indications that people in every one of the above organizations or collections of persons belong to the Power Control Group; in other words, they are seeking actively to cover up the assassinations, or to continue the cover-ups of the assassinations.

Hard Evidence of Conspiracy

Anyone who has honestly and openly taken the time to examine just a few pieces of "hard" evidence in any one of the four major cases, has no trouble at all deciding that there were in fact individual conspiracies in each one.

In the face of this situation, the layman (and 80% of the people of the U.S.) wonder why the Congress, either the Senate or the House, is continually demanding "hard" evidence of conspiracy. Statements continue to appear in the media to the effect that, "I've seen no evidence of conspiracy." Or, "We are not sure whether there were others involved in addition to Lee Harvey Oswald, Sirhan Sirhan, James Earl Ray or Arthur Bremer." These statements are made in spite of the fact that even the most casual analysis clearly shows that Oswald, Sirhan, and Ray did not fire any of the shots that struck JFK, RFK and MLK, and that they were all framed. Bremer fired some of the shots in the Wallace case, but there is evidence of another gun being fired.

The essence of this situation is that it is to be this way forever — in the style of George Orwell's "1984". The "hard" evidence is all old evidence; it goes back at least to 1964 in the JFK case, and back to 1970-1972 in the RFK and MLK cases. The Wallace evidence is a little fresher and a little less "hard", but nevertheless convincing.

The people who keep demanding new "hard" evidence are either members of the PCG, or are brainwashed by the media members of the PCG into ignoring the old evidence. These people do not choose to "see" or to "hear" the old evidence, even when it is literally placed before their very eyes and ears. Thus the call for "hard evidence" has become merely a substitute for the words "no conspiracy."

The Bottom Up Approach

Under these conditions of rewritten history enforced by the media, the bottom up approach is doomed to failure. No matter how hard the Select Committee tries and no matter how much effort any official body puts into attempts to offer that "bombshell" that Tip O'Neill and others keep looking for, the "admitted proof" of conspiracies in the JFK and MLK cases is doomed to failure. Why?

The simple answer is that the PCG is in complete control of the situation. Of greatest importance they control the media. Second, the media controls the minds of most citizens as well as the Congress, especially when a push comes to show and expose what is really happening. The PCG is a living dynamic body right now. They can eliminate an investigation or investigators, right now. They can eliminate (reduce to powerlessness, etc.) a member of the House or a member of the Select Committee, right now.

The bottom-up approach can never get off the ground, because the PCG will not let it. As long as they control all of the sources of evidence that may contain the "hard" evidence, such as the FBI, CIA, and local police files; as long as they control the courts; and as long as they control the media; nobody will be allowed to "prove" a "hard" evidence case in front of the entire House or Senate, or to make a case to the President or any body in the Executive Branch.

So another approach will have to be developed.

The Events of 1976 and 1977

The evidence of the existence of the PCG and their control seems clearer in March 1977 than it ever has been before. They are almost operating in above-ground, blatant fashion, so confident or determined have they become. They are operating in real time now, as events develop. Any observer who keeps his eyes wide open and assumes that such a group exists, can see the evidence clearly nearly every day.

The prime objectives of the PCG in 1976 and 1977 have become:

1. To block and eliminate the Select Committee on Assassinations in the House of Representatives.
2. To plant the substitute or fallback position idea in the minds of the people and the Congress that the JFK assassination was a Castro plot.
3. To block any other Congressional attempts to investigate the four cases.
4. To control the Carter Administration in such a way as to permit only an executive branch investigation that will conclude there was a Castro-based JFK conspiracy and no conspiracy in the other cases.

But the 1977 activities of the PCG are open to a new approach. We will label this the "top-down approach" to exposing the truth about what has been going on.

Exposing the PCG

From what has been said so far, the "top-down approach" must obviously begin with exposure of the PCG and the activities they are engaged in today, in 1977. The list of such activities is very long and their weakest points should be selected for exposure. The following examples are illustrative only.

The Select Committee rather than this author is certainly in a better position to know which individuals and which actions taken by the PCG since the formation of the Committee in September 1976, would be most easily investigated. The first example is the leak and subsequent release of the Attorney General Levi, Justice Department, report on the King case.

The Justice Department King Report

An exposure of the PCG member's actions in the February 2, 1977, leak of the King report, and its release a few weeks later, must begin with a review of who the PCG members are in the cover-up of the King case. "The Taking of America 1-2-3", chapter 6, lists the following members of the PCG in the King cover-up:

J. Edgar Hoover
Memphis FBI people
Phil Canale - Memphis D.A.
Fred Vinson - State Department
Judge Battle

Percy Foreman
William Bradford Huie
Gerald Frank - author
Frank Holloman and other members of the Memphis police, and
other judges at state and federal court levels.

One of the judges who became a PCG member in later years was Judge McCrea. He heard James Earl Ray's plea for a new trial. Solid evidence of conspiracy at the framing of Ray was introduced at that hearing.

Everyone who has read or heard the evidence, with the exception of Judge McCrea and his law clerk who did all of the work, has reached the conclusion that Ray was framed and that his lawyer, Percy Foreman, deliberately mishandled the case. Nevertheless, McCrea decided that Ray would not get a new trial. The case was appealed all the way to the Supreme Court with no reversals of the decision.

Leaking the Justice Department Report on the King Case

Some years later, Attorney General Levi ordered a review by the Justice Department of the Dr. King assassination and the FBI's handling of its investigation. A report was prepared by Michael J. Shaheen who did most of the Justice Department work.

No public announcement of the completion of the report was made in 1976. Suddenly, on the exact same day that the House was debating whether to reconstitute the Select Committee, (February 2, 1977) the King report was leaked to the Republican minority leader of the opposition to the continuance of the Select Committee. Representative Quillen from, guess where, Tennessee, was the leader and he announced he had a copy of the report.

Representative Yvonne Burke from California, a member of the Select Committee and also a member of the House Committee responsible for oversight of the Justice Department, took strong issue with Quillen over the leak. She said she had tried to obtain the report all that day from the Justice Department and could not. Quillen at first stated he did not have the report, but had an Associated Press release describing the report. About an hour later in the late afternoon, he said he had received a copy of the report. Burke stated that was very strange because the proper committee of the House had not received a copy.

The whole point of the leak was that the report was quoted as saying that Justice had closed the King case with the final conclusion that James Earl Ray was the lone assassin and that there had been no conspiracy. This statement coming at that very moment, placed in the hands of the opposition to the Select Committee, was of course very strategically useful. Quillen argued against continuing the Committee on the strength of the conclusions reached in the report.

Releasing the Report

That was not to be the end of the use of this weapon, however. On another strategically important day for the Select Committee, February 19, 1977, the report was actually released by the Justice Department with blaring headlines, again emphasizing no conspiracy and exonerating the FBI in the conduct of their investigation.

The date was important because of a showdown meeting scheduled for February 21 between Henry Gonzalez and Tip O'Neill, to be followed the same day by a meeting of the Select Committee to determine whether

they would continue with Richard A. Sprague as chief counsel.

In addition to the absurdity of the report itself, as demonstrated by the excerpts from it, published in the "New York Times" in the February 19, 1977 edition, the PCG's tactics became somewhat obvious on that date. Attorney General Griffin Bell, having inherited the report and the entire situation from Mr. Levi, let slip an important opinion on the CBS program "Face the Nation", on the Sunday before the report was described as "still secret", by the UPI news release quoting Mr. Bell.

He said he believed there were unanswered questions and that you could still wonder if there had to be a conspiracy after reading the report. Bell clarified his concerns after the February 19 release of the report, by stating on February 24 that he might want to interview Ray to find out where Ray obtained all of the money he had before and after King was shot, and whether anyone helped him obtain false passports and to make travel arrangements. Perhaps Bell was troubled by one of the report's silly conclusions, that one of Ray's motives in killing King was to make a "quick profit."

The indications from all of this are two-fold. First, it seems obvious that Mr. Bell (and presumably President Jimmy Carter) are not members of the PCG cover-up section on the King case. Secondly, it also seems obvious that Mr. Levi and the people preparing the report and conducting the review, had definitely become members of the PCG. The timed release and leaking of that report, and the total whitewash of any King conspiracy (like the Warren Report) are too patently obvious to be coincidental.

This is one area where the Select Committee has an excellent chance to expose a raw nerve of the PCG.

Michael Shaheen - PCG Member

A key PCG member in the situation would appear to be Mr. Shaheen. Guess who was Judge McCrea's law clerk mentioned earlier in the PCG cover-up in Memphis? Shaheen was not only deeply involved in that part of the cover-up as well as the new cover-up. He is from Memphis. He is part of that closed circle of people in Tennessee who know very well what happened to Martin Luther King, and how Ray was framed. Mr. Shaheen is now planning to become a judge in Memphis with the help of all his co-conspirators and PCG members. A nice reward for his two part cover-up work!

Who called the shots in this Justice Department effort? Was it Levi? Was it the higher up members of the PCG left over from the Nixon-Ford administration? Was it the "old boy" network, or J. Edgar Hoover's ghost, or members of the PCG still around at the FBI? Was it the Tennessee wing of the PCG that could apparently include Judge McCrea, Phil Canale, Howard Baker, Mr. Quillen, and Bernard Fensterwald, Jr.? The Select Committee should find out.

The report itself is so easily attacked as to be laughable. It even quotes the fake testimony of Charlie Stevens all over again, as if no one knew that he had been bought off by J. Edgar Hoover to dream up his identification of Ray after being dead drunk and seeing nothing on the day of the assassination.

Ignoring or Suppressing Conspiracy and Framing Evidence

The review by Shaheen dared not touch any of the evidence of conspiracy or the framing of Ray that had been introduced at the hearing that Judge McCrea and Shaheen knew so very well. The witnesses who had seen Ray at a gas station several blocks from the assassination site when the shot was fired had to be ignored. Grace Stevens who saw "Frenchy-Raoul" in the rooming house, who identified Frenchy as the man she saw, and who knew that Charlie had seen nothing, had to be ignored. The witnesses who saw Jack Youngblood move away from the bushes from which he had fired the shot, had to be ignored. The use by Hoover and Fred Vinson of Stevens' false testimony to extradite Ray from London had to be ignored. The total seizure and control of the case by the FBI in Memphis, including instructions to the witnesses who had seen Frenchy, to keep quiet, was to be kept a dark secret. The similarity of Frenchy's photo to the sketch of Raoul, and Ray's subsequent identification to his lawyer of Frenchy as Raoul had to be kept quiet.

Also suppressed was the bribing of Huie and Foreman, and their role in convincing Ray that the photos of Frenchy-Raoul taken in Dealey Plaza were from the FBI, thereby scaring him into believing that the FBI was behind his incarceration and framing. (This, of course, was actually true). Those photos had been shown to Ray in his cell by Foreman, who got them, not from the FBI, but from this author through Huie.

Also ignored was the evidence turned up by Huie that he had found three witnesses who had seen Ray and Frenchy-Raoul together in Atlanta and Montreal, thus confirming Ray's claim that he was framed. All of the evidence of involvement of Youngblood and Frenchy uncovered by Robert Livingston and Wayne Chastain, and published in "Computers and People" in 1974 was naturally omitted.

Livingston was Ray's attorney in Tennessee. Chastain is a Memphis reporter. Also ignored was Livingston and Chastain's sighting of Frenchy-Raoul at the Detroit airport, during a meeting between them and Bud Fensterwald, and the intermediary representing Frenchy in an attempt to obtain immunity for him in exchange for revealing the identity of the Tennesseans and Louisianians who had hired him.

Mr. Shaheen knows what to focus on (1) to protect the PCG and (2) the last line of defense of the badly tarnished reputation of J. Edgar Hoover. J. Edgar was one of the most important PCG members. His ghost lives on, controlling America through his PCG heirs.

Exposure of this entire segment of PCG would do more to bolster the 1977 efforts of the Select Committee than any presentation of conspiracy evidence in the King case itself.

The PCG's Tactics with the Select Committee

The second example of an exposure point with the PCG is their treatment of the Select Committee itself. In the early days of the formation of the Committee in September 1976, the PCG may have been taking the Committee very lightly. The PCG efforts to stop an investigation from beginning in the spring of 1976, by controlling the Rules Committee, had been successful. Downing and Gonzalez had given up.

But when the three-way coalition with the Black Caucus suddenly brought about a reversal of their earlier Rules Committee vote, then the House quickly

and overwhelmingly passed the resolution setting up the Committee. And the PCG was forced to go back to the drawing boards for retaliation.

Almost before the PCG had time to react, Downing and Gonzalez had hired Richard A. Sprague of Philadelphia as chief counsel. Not one to fool around, Sprague hired very rapidly the equivalent of his own FBI. He sensed from the start that he might be up against both the FBI and the CIA. So he carefully screened his investigators, lawyers, researchers and other personnel to prevent intelligence penetration of the staff. However, some personnel were "handed" to him by both Gonzalez and Downing.

It goes almost without saying that the PCG would try to infiltrate the staff. What they learned by such infiltration over the period of the few weeks between Sprague's arrival and the beginning of the 1977 Congress in December 1976, was that, horror of horrors, Sprague and his crack team were not only on the right track in both JFK and MLK investigations, but that the tactics the PCG had begun to use in those weeks were beginning to make both the staff and some of the committee members suspicious about the PCG itself.

PCG Control of Prior Investigations

It became imperative for the PCG to eliminate either the entire Committee and the staff, or to gain control of it and to get rid of Richard A. Sprague and his senior staff people who were loyal to him. It was no longer possible to turn the investigations around and bury the information that had been gathered, as the PCG had been able to do with six prior Congressional investigations. In each of the six, five Senate investigations and one House investigation of the JFK assassination, the PCG had controlled the results, disbanded the staffs, and buried the evidence, with none of it showing up in the reports or being passed on to the succeeding committees. The six groups were:

1. 1968: Senate subcommittee under Senator Ed Long of Missouri conducted a JFK investigation. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr. was in charge of a six-person team.
2. 1974: Ervin Committee investigated the JFK case during the Watergate period. Samuel Dash headed a team of four including Terry Lenzner, Barry Schochet and Wayne Bishop.
3. 1975: Church Committee - a six-person team reported to FAO Schwartz III, including Bob Kelley, Dan Dwyer, Ed Greissing, Paul Wallach, Pat Shea, and David Aaron.
4. 1975: Schweiker-Hart subcommittee under the Church Committee. A team headed by David Marsten, included Troy Gustafson, Gaetan Fonzi, and Elliott Maxwell.
5. 1975: Pike Committee in House - staff people not known at this writing.
6. 1976: Senate Intelligence Committee under Daniel Inouye - staff people not known.

In addition, both Howard Baker and Lowell Weicker conducted their own investigations of the JFK case during the Watergate period.

Sprague and his senior staff people are professionals compared to the amateurs listed above. Wayne Bishop was the only professional investigator in all of the staff groups. It was easy for the PCG to cut off or alter the directions of the prior investigations. Thus, the one with the greatest hope, the Schweiker subcommittee, wound up not mentioning any of the important evidence uncovered in Florida and elsewhere, in their final report. The Congress

and the public were left with the impression that there might have been a Castro turnaround conspiracy to assassinate JFK.

PCG Strategy

Faced with a tougher and larger nut to crack, with the new committee and Sprague and his large, loyal staff, the PCG had to devise a different strategy. They opened up with a number of parallel tactics. They were:

1. Attack Dick Sprague - try to discredit him - dig up dirt and print it.
2. Use the media - TV, newspapers, radio, magazines, etc., to spread PCG propaganda - control the sources of all stories about the Select Committee.
3. Use PCG congressmen to provide biased, distorted quotes in the media.
4. Try to discredit the entire committee by making it appear disorganized and unmanageable.
5. Control the voting and the lobbying against the continuation of the committee in January and February.
6. A massive letter and telegram campaign to influence members of the House to vote against the committee.
7. Exaggeration and emphasis placed on the size of the budget requested by Sprague, coupled with deemphasis on the reasons for the budget, and blackout of the Committee's year end report.
8. Continual pounding away that there is no new evidence, coupled with a demand that the committee justify its existence by producing new evidence.
9. Splitting the committee up, attempting to create dissention. Creating a fake battle between Henry Gonzalez and Dick Sprague or between Gonzalez and Downing.
10. Hamstringing the staff so they could not receive salaries, could not travel, did not have subpoena power, could not make long distance telephone calls, blocked access to the key files at the FBI, Justice Department, CIA and Secret Service.
11. Tried to insert their own man at the head of the staff.
12. Brainwashed Rep. Henry Gonzalez, and made him believe Sprague and others were agents.
13. Sacrificed Rep. Henry Gonzalez as chairman when it became obvious they could not succeed with him as their controlled chairman.
14. Leaking stories seeming to make the committee's efforts unnecessary: "Castro did it" stories. Justice Dept. report on the King case, etc.

Media Control

The prime technique in all of this has been the nearly absolute control of the media. It is not as difficult to achieve as one might imagine. In the first place, most of the stories about the committee originate in Washington under rather tightly controlled conditions, so it is only necessary to control a small number of key reporters and the bosses in charge of them. The rest of the media follow along like sheep, and lapping up the stories.

The PCG trotted out some of their old timers in the media wing to initiate the public and congressional brainwashing program against the committee. This was an old familiar tactic used effectively against Jim Garrison in 1967-1969. The old timers included three newspaper reporter members of the PCG

and their Secret Team bosses:

Jeremiah O'Leary of the "Washington Star" was on the CIA's list of reporters exposed the year before.

George Lardner Jr. had been in David Ferrie's apartment on the morning he was murdered until 4 a.m. Lardner was a PCG member then, in 1967, working as a reporter for the "Washington Post" and is still with the "Post".

David Burnham at the "New York Times", one of several reporters in Harrison Salisbury's and Harding Bancroft Jr.'s stable of PCG workers. Burnham was available for cover-up and brainwashing duty, and was called upon to carry the brunt of the Times' attack.

They must have had fun from November 1976 to March 1977. It was like the old times in New Orleans in 1967 and 1968.

There were, of course, others. As in 1967 and at other times during the decade of media cover-ups, the major TV, radio, wire service, magazine and newspaper media acted as a cover-up unit:

Ben Bradlee, the PCG chieftain at the "Washington Post", made sure that "Newsweek" did their hatchet jobs.

Time Inc., CBS with Eric Sevaried, Dick Salant and Leslie Midgeley,

NBC with David Brinkley, and

ABC with Bob Clark and Howard K. Smith, all went on the attack.

The overall continuing theme was that the committee would die out soon.

Media Tactics

The tactics used at first were to create the impression that the Committee was not going to find anything of importance.

Then Richard A. Sprague became the chief target. Dirty tricks galore began to be used against him. As with Garrison, one of these was to portray him as arrogant, flamboyant, power mad, and as a man usurping the powers of the Committee. The writers and editors of the PCG are very good at this sort of thing. The "New York Times", with Burnham writing and Salisbury and Bancroft directing, produced a real hatchet job. These techniques convinced congressmen and much of the public, just as they had with Garrison. Sprague was forced to stay very quiet and away from reporters or cameras. That did not deter the PCG people. Once an image of a man has been created by the media, it is not necessary for him to appear in public. He could even disappear entirely for several weeks and then the flamboyant, noisy image would go on uninterrupted.

This technique is much less obvious than murder, and it works nearly as well. For, when the time comes to destroy or eliminate a man, all the PCG has to do is eliminate the image. In this case, the defensive strategy called for was to have someone on the Committee or in Congress eliminate the false image of Richard A. Sprague.

The Vote to Continue

The man chosen to eliminate Sprague was the new chairman of the Select Committee, Rep. Henry Gonzalez. Before setting up a classical "personality conflict" between Gonzalez and Sprague, the PCG introduced another tactic. It was an attempt to kill the Committee by voting not to continue it in the 1977 Congress.

The foundation for this tactic was the ballooning

out of all proportion by the House and Media PCG members, (1) the large size budget that Dick Sprague had requested, and (2) the use of polygraph, psychological stress evaluator, and telephone monitoring equipment. Rather than telling the truth about the budget, describing how the money would be spent, and how the equipment was going to be used, the media, aided and abetted by PCG members in the House itself, made it seem as though the budget was totally out of line. Also, that citizen's rights would be violated by use of the equipment. The PCG planted false information leading Don Edwards of California to play into their hands on the equipment issue.

The year end report of the Committee, which they and the staff hoped would make these subjects clear, was excellent in terms of countering the media attacks. But, of course the PCG controls the media; so the report was completely blacked out. Most citizens do not even know it exists. Yet almost every U.S. citizen has heard and seen Dick Sprague called a rattlesnake and an unscrupulous character. The ignoring of the Committee's year end report should have been for them and for the staff, one of the first lessons showing the PCG's power and why the "bottom up", perfectly logical approach is doomed ahead of time to failure.

However, the PCG lost the vote against continuing the Committee and so used a new method to try to kill it.

The New Tactic

The PCG decided to use Gonzalez to control the Committee. The stage was set for the PCG to knock off Sprague and to install one of their own men. The plan was to do this by brainwashing Henry Gonzalez into total distrust of Sprague and selected members of the Committee and the staff.

The idea was then to use Henry Gonzalez in this way to install a PCG man (the fact that he was a PCG man was unknown to Henry) as chief of staff. Henry would also fire Sprague and the key loyal staff members, first blocking their access to the important files and witnesses. The PCG would then have been in a position to either fold up the Committee by March 31, or to direct its efforts toward finding a "Castro Did It" conspiracy and no conspiracy in the King case.

Tactic Backfires

The PCG did not forecast one important effect of their tactics. By the time Henry Gonzalez became chairman, the other eleven members of the Committee, along with the staff, had begun to smell a rat. They noted with curiosity all of the strange coincidences that seemed to be happening. On February 2, 1977 during the floor debate over continuing the Committee, Representatives Devine, Preyer, Burke, and Fauntroy let the rest of the House know that they believed something peculiar was happening to them. The appearance of the Justice Department report on that same day disturbed them very much. The attacks on Sprague, who most of them had gotten to know fairly well, upset them also.

The staff were even more disturbed. Most of them, as with Sprague, had assumed they were being asked to conduct a thorough, unbiased investigation of two homicides. The power of the PCG became obvious to them over a period of several weeks. The effect of all this on both Committee and staff, was to drive all 84 people (73 staff and 11 Committee members) into a solid block (the only exceptions were Gon-

zalez' people on the staff), to "hanging in there" together, more determined than ever, to keep going, and to get at the truth. They became 84 very angry men and women. Some staffers began using their own money for travel. All of them took pay cuts. Many of them decided they would work for nothing if necessary to keep going. The PCG's strategy had backfired in this important regard. The 84 loyal people were like one giant lion backed into a corner, spurred on to greater heights to fight back.

For this reason, the tactic for using a brainwashed Henry Gonzalez failed. The 84 people resisted that maneuver by all threatening to resign en masse. Tip O'Neill and others were forced to go against Gonzalez. He resigned. The House voted by a large majority to accept his resignation and Tip O'Neill appointed Louis Stokes as the new chairman.

At this point, the PCG decided to abandon Henry and the tactic and to try another tactic. The sacrifice of Henry was signalled by an article in the "Washington Star" on March 3, 1977. It was by Lynn Rosellini, Star staff writer, and was titled "Gonzalez' Action Stuns Panel but Not the Home Folks." It was manufactured by the PCG to begin the discrediting of Henry and his final demise. It was the first anti-Gonzalez article to appear. The PCG had obviously decided to throw him to the wolves. The significant quote was supposedly from a "source familiar with Gonzalez' career." He said, "Henry focuses in on conspiracies, the weird angles of things. Once he gets involved in something, he shakes it by the throat until it's dead." That is a dead giveaway that the PCG no longer wants Henry around.

Next Tactic - Death by Acclamation

The PCG's next tactic was to convince a majority of the House that the Committee had had it because of the feuding as portrayed in the press. They hoped (1) to eliminate the Committee altogether, or (2) at least knock out the JFK investigation or (3) to force Sprague to resign. After all, the King conspiracy can always be blamed on good old J. Edgar Hoover, if it comes down to that. There is no particular spillover from the King case into JFK, RFK or Wallace, provided "Frenchy-Raoul" can be kept out of the lime-light. It might then have been possible for PCG Congressmen to propose dropping the JFK case or postponing it in favor of continuing just the King case with a reduced budget. Prior to March 31, a House floor vote could have been proposed or a vote in the Rules Committee to limit the investigations and the authority of the Select Committee in this way. The rules under which the Select Committee would operate were not passed by the Committee due to the conflict between Henry Gonzalez and the rest of the members. So the proposal could have included restrictive rules. The PCG media could have boosted this idea and so could the PCG loyalists in the House. Jim Wright appeared to be the new leader of the opposition to kill the Select Committee. The ground was being laid every day for a negative vote on continuation, by hinting that the Committee must come up with a bombshell or that it would die.

The Committee fought off this tactic by diverting the attention of the media wing of the PCG through a series of very rapidly developing activities and a substantial reduction in the proposed budget, which went down to \$2.8 million for the balance of 1977. The "death by acclamation" tactic lost out in the melee of such activity.

The House finally voted to continue the committee by a very narrow margin with a swing of 25 votes

determining the result. The final weapon used to obtain a vote to continue the Committee on March 30 was the resignation of Dick Sprague. In spite of this temporary setback the PCG will continue to fight back. Their next tactic will be an attack on the budget.

Exposing the PCG

The best way to overwhelm the PCG is to expose the PCG itself, and to demonstrate that it has been influencing or controlling the media, and attempting to control Congress. How can this be done?

First, it will be necessary to demonstrate who the PCG members are, in the House and the media and to demonstrate exactly what they have been doing and are doing, while they are doing it. Getting this kind of information out to the public will be very difficult since all the media seems to be under control. There is one trick that might work, however: live TV. That is not easily controllable. That is one of the ways in which Sam Ervin produced changes in the United States. If unannounced exposures of PCG members are made on live TV, there would be no way for the PCG to stop it. About the only way to set up such a situation would be to hold public hearings with live TV coverage.

Exposing the PCG to Congress might be accomplished on the floor of the House. Evidence of the clandestine activities of the PCG members in the tactics described above could be introduced on the floor without media coverage. This happened to a minor extent on March 30, when some of the Committee members began to accuse the media of improper influence.

Who Are the PCG Members?

The PCG members presently attempting to kill or control the Select Committee need to be clearly identified. There are perhaps some media people and some Representatives who sincerely believe that there were no conspiracies and who therefore have been playing into the hands of the PCG without realizing it. But other Representatives, and media people (by definition of the term PCG) are purposefully controlling the situation. It may be difficult to distinguish between these two groups without tracing back some PCG connection of the persons.

Any CIA or FBI clandestine relationship or any direct connection with any of the assassination cases, would of course be a tipoff. An example of this is George Lardner, Jr.'s direct connection ten years ago with the JFK case. Lardner was in David Ferrie's apartment for four hours after the midnight time of death estimated by the New Orleans coroner. Ferrie was killed by a karate chop to the back of his neck. Jim Garrison interrogated Lardner at some length, but never received a satisfactory explanation of what Lardner had been doing in Ferrie's apartment.

The potential media PCG members who have written anti-Select committee articles are: George Lardner, Jr., of the "Washington Post"; David Burnham, of the "New York Times"; and Jeremiah O'Leary of the "Washington Star". Eric Sevareid of CBS, Howard K. Smith of ABC, and David Brinkley of NBC have all offered anti-Select Committee editorial comment. Other potential media PCG members are: Harry Livingstone, claiming to be representing Zodiac News Service, but not actually representing them; Lynn Rosellini of the "Washington Star"; Nicholas Horrock of the "New York Times", writer of the pro-Warren Commission articles; Ben Bradlee of the "Washington Post" and "Newsweek", PCG member at "Post"; Harrison Salisbury and Harding Bancroft, Jr. of the "New York Times", PCG members; Ri-

chard Salant of CBS, PCG member at CBS; and Leslie Midgeley of CBS, producer of two Warren Commission support program series.

Chapter 9 of "The Taking of America 1-2-3" described how the PCG, through the Bobby Kennedy "New Team" members in the media plus the "Old Boy" CIA network or Secret Team members in the media, controlled the 15 major news organizations on the subject of assassination conspiracies. These team members penetrated: the "Washington Post" (Ben Bradlee); the "New York Times" (Harding Bancroft, Jr.); CBS (Richard Salant); and 12 other TV, radio, wire service, newspaper, and magazine news sources. They are still active.

In some cases it is only necessary for two people to control assassination stories, a reporter and a Secret Team member on a high management level. For example, Ben Bradlee and George Lardner, Jr., at the "Washington Post" could alone bias the stories about assassinations in a manner satisfactory to the PCG.

The potential PCG members who are Congressional Representatives who spoke against the Select Committee are: Bauman (MD); Lott (MS); Morgan (IL); Long (LA); Clawson (CA); Milford (TX); McClory (IL); Collins (TX); Rudd; Skubitz; and Wright (TX). Other potential members are: Sisk (CA), Rules Committee opposition leader; Frank Thompson (NJ), leader of financial opposition to Select Committee; and Pickle (TX), witness against Richard A. Sprague and the Select Committee at the Rules Committee meeting on March 28.

While it may be difficult to tell which of these congressmen are acting sincerely and which ones are knowingly trying to extend the cover-ups, nevertheless the Select Committee must turn its attention to any member of the House who throws up roadblocks, or speaks out strongly against the continuation of the investigations. On this basis, one must suspect every one of the Representatives on the above list.

Many questions should be asked of each person in this group. For example:

Who encouraged Mr. Bauman last autumn and on March 30, Mr. Sisk last spring, and Mr. Quillen in February, to suddenly become so vehement about stopping investigations of the assassinations?

Their stated reasons (the Kennedys are opposed, costs, no new evidence, Warren Commission was right, etc.) no longer can hold enough water to make it believable that they were acting from their own true beliefs.

On whose behalf were they acting?

How did Trent Lott find out that the Committee staff made a telephone call to Cameroon, which he discussed on March 28 at the Rules Committee meeting?

Who talked Frank Thompson into a campaign to shut off the Select Committee's financial resources?

The Thompson efforts were too extreme to be explained away by the ordinary controller's motivations.

Who convinced Jim Wright that the Committee was doomed and that he should personally intervene in the Gonzalez, Sprague, and Committee members battle?

And most importantly, who brainwashed both Henry Gonzalez and Gail Beagle into mistrusting all of the people whom they had previously always trusted?

Answer these questions and publicize the answers — and the top down approach to exposing the PCG and solving the assassination conspiracies will be started along the path to success.